

REMARKS

(A) STATUS OF THE APPLICATION

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his clear explanation of the rejections in the Office Action dated March 06, 2006.

(I) DISPOSITION OF CLAIMS

- (i) Claims 1-586 have been canceled.
- (ii) Claim 587-612 are pending in the application.
- (iii) Claims 587, 590-597, 600-605, 607, 608, 610, and 611 have been rejected.
- (iv) Claims 588, 589, 599, 606, 609, and 612 are objected to.

(II) APPLICANTS' ACTION

- (i) Applicants respond to the rejection of Claims 587, 590-597, 600-605, 607, 608, 610, and 611.
- (ii) Applicants have amended Claim 587.
- (iii) Applicants respond to the objection of Claims 588, 589, 599, 606, 609, and 612.

(B) RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B)

Claims 587, 590-597, 600-605, 607, 608, 610 and 611 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by van Asselt.¹ According to the Examiner's remarks in the Office Action, the claims were examined as if the transitional phrase "consisting essentially of" is equivalent to the transitional phrase "comprising" because there is an absence of a clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed invention.²

Applicants believe that the above point equating the two "standards" does not apply to these particular claims because the transitional phrase "consisting essentially of" is applied only to the monomers themselves. Moreover, olefins and olefinic compounds are well defined in organic chemistry and would therefore not

¹ van Asselt, *et al*, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1994, 116, 977-985.

² *citing* PPG Industries v. Guardian Industries, 156 F.3d 1351, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

include CO (carbon monoxide). However, in order to advance prosecution, Claim 587 has been amended to delete the word "essentially" so that the transitional phrase for Claim 587 is now "consisting of." Applicants presume this will overcome the rejection. Allowance of all rejected claims is respectfully solicited.

(C) RESPONSE TO OBJECTION OF CLAIMS

Applicants have amended Claim 587 and believe that the rejection of all the rejected claims, including Claim 587 is overcome. Because Claims 588, 589, 599, 606, 609, and 612 are therefore not dependent upon rejected claims, the objection to said claims is overcome. Applicants respectfully solicit withdrawal of objection to said claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that stated grounds of rejection and objection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot and that a complete response has been made to the final Office Action mailed on March 06, 2006.

Therefore, Applicants believe that the application stands in condition for allowance with withdrawal of all grounds of rejection. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has questions regarding the application or the contents of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Should there be a fee due which is not accounted for, please charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1928.

Respectfully Submitted,

BY:



Date: May 30, 2006

RAKESH H. MEHTA, ESQUIRE
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
REGISTRATION No.: 50,224
PHONE: 302-984-6089
FAX: 302-658-1192